Artificial Quantum Thermal Bath

Alireza Shabani and Hartmut Neven
Quantum Artificial Intelligence Lab,
Google Inc., Venice, CA, 90291
(Dated: October 16, 2015)

Temperature determines the relative probability of observing a physical system in an energy state when that system is energetically in equilibrium with its environment. In this manuscript, we present a theory for engineering the temperature of a quantum system different from its ambient temperature, that is basically an analog version of the quantum metropolis algorithm. We define criteria for an engineered quantum bath that, when couples to a quantum system with Hamiltonian H, drives the system to the equilibrium state $\frac{e^{-H/T}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H/T})}$ with a tunable parameter T. For a system of superconducting qubits, we propose a circuit-QED approximate realization of such an engineered thermal bath consisting of driven lossy resonators. We consider an artificial thermal bath as a simulator for many-body physics or a controllable temperature knob for a hybrid quantum-thermal annealer.

arXiv:1510.04354v1 [quant-ph] 15 Oct 2015

Introduction- Calculating the Gibbs state or partition function of a many-body physical system are fundamental computational problems in and a bridge across statistical physics [1], quantum computation [2, 3], and machine learning [4]. In statistical physics, estimating a partition function is known to be computationally hard [5, 6]. Quantum metropolis algorithms have been proposed as a solution, although they demand a large-scale universal digital quantum computer [7–11]. In the context of simulated thermal annealing, sampling from the Gibbs state is a classical algorithm for solving computational problems on a digital classical computer [3]. As an alternative solution, in this manuscript we propose an analog (dynamical) approach to prepare the Gibbs state of a many-body quantum system. We accomplish this goal by engineering an artificial quantum thermal bath. The analog nature of our proposal opens new paths for the application of midsize quantum computers. We reference the method of cavity cooling [12], which addresses a similar question for a single mode harmonic oscillator, a system of non-interacting qubits [13], and an exactly solvable Bose-Hubbard chain [14]. Here we avoid the hypothetical assumption of bath eigenstate thermalization as in ref. [15].

Universal Quantum Thermal Bath- We begin with an *operational* definition of temperature since we consider temperature as a knob for an analog computation. Given a quantum system S with Hamiltonian H_S, we say the system is at temperature T if its state is represented by the density matrix $\frac{e^{-H_S/T}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H_S/T})}$. Correspondingly, we define a *universal* artificial quantum thermal bath as a quantum system B that, when coupled to the system S, sets its temperature with the following criteria

(i) The bath Hamiltonian and system-bath interaction are independent of the system Hamiltonian.

(ii) The bath internal dynamics are tunable.

(iii) The strength of system-bath interaction is tunable.

Condition (i) carries the notion of universality by ensuring that as the system Hamiltonian changes (e.g. programming problem Hamiltonian of an annealer) the bath thermalization functionality is intact. Conditions (ii) and (iii), as described below, correspond to tunability of the temperature and rate of thermalization.

Microscopic Theory- The theory of open quantum systems offers a detailed description of how quantum systems thermalize when coupled to a *natural* thermal bath [16]. Here the word natural refers to the surrounding environment and distinguishes it from an engineered bath. In this case, the bath itself is assumed to be at temperature T_{env} in state $\frac{e^{-H_B/T_{env}}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H_B/T_{env}})}$. If the bath is weakly and linearly coupled to the system and its fluctuations satisfy the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) condition , the equilibrium state of the system is guaranteed to be $\frac{e^{-H_S/T_{env}}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H_S/T_{env}})}$ [16], obeying thermodynamic laws. A natural thermal bath is not universal as there is no switch to turn it off. Also, changing the environment temperature is an impractical option, motivating the research presented in this article. For instance, superconducting qubit systems are kept in a fridge at a few mK, and raising the temperature of the fridge (a slow process) would excite multiple types of unwanted noise sources of noise.

We develop a theory for an analog quantum thermal bath based on engineering the bath's dynamical fluctuations and KMS conditions. We begin with the derivation of a quantum master equation for a bath out of thermal equilibrium with time-dependent system-bath interaction. We consider system S as weakly coupled to an auxiliary quantum system (bath) B. In superconducting systems, the bath can consist of resonators [17–20], qubits, or meta-materials [21, 24, 25]. For a total system-bath Hamiltonian $H_{SB} = H_S + H_B + H_I(t)$, dynamics are described by

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}_{SB}}{dt} = -i[\tilde{H}_I(t), \tilde{\rho}_{SB}(t)] \tag{1}$$

where $\sim$ refers to the interaction picture.

For weak system-bath interaction, the second-order pertur-

bative solution of the dynamics yields

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}_S}{dt} = -i\text{tr}_B[\tilde{H}_I(t), \rho_{SB}(0)] - \int_0^t ds\text{tr}_B[\tilde{H}_I(t), [\tilde{H}_I(s), \tilde{\rho}_{SB}(s)]] \quad (2)$$

Here we neglect the first term on the RHS, assuming $tr_B[\tilde{H}_I(t), \rho_{SB}(0)] = 0$. We will discuss this assumption further below.

The next assumption we use is the Markovian approximation. For this we need the auxiliary system B to be strongly attracted to an equilibrium state $\rho_B^{SS}(t)$ such that, after any perturbative kick by the system, it quickly relaxes back to its equilibrium state. In general, the bath steady-state can be time dependent. An example of such an auxiliary system that we propose below is a strongly lossy resonator in a coherent equilibrium state. As a result of the Born-Markov approximation we have $\tilde{\rho}_{SB}(t) \approx \tilde{\rho}_S(t) \otimes \tilde{\rho}_B^{SS}(t)$ and arrive at

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}_S}{dt} = -\int_0^\infty ds\text{tr}_B[\tilde{H}_I(t), [\tilde{H}_I(t-s), \tilde{\rho}_S(t)\otimes\tilde{\rho}_B^{SS}(t)]] \quad (3)$$

Next we consider system-Bath interaction terms of the form $H_I = \sum_\alpha g_\alpha S_\alpha \otimes B_\alpha(t)$ (with Hermitian operators S_α and B_α). Given projective decomposition $H_S = \sum_\epsilon \epsilon\Pi(\epsilon)$, we define the system operators as

$$S_\alpha(\omega) = \sum_{\epsilon'-\epsilon=\omega} \Pi(\epsilon)S_\alpha\Pi(\epsilon') \quad (4)$$

We apply the rotating-wave approximation by constraining the coupling strengths g_α such that the resulting thermalization rate is weaker than the minimum system frequency $\omega = \epsilon' - \epsilon$. Applying this approximation to (3), we obtain the Lindblad equation

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}_S}{dt} = \mathcal{D}(\tilde{\rho}_S) = \quad (5)$$
$$\sum_{\omega,\alpha,\alpha'} \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega, t)\Big(S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\tilde{\rho}_S S_\alpha^\dagger(\omega) - S_\alpha^\dagger(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\tilde{\rho}_S\Big) + h.c.$$

with fluctuation coefficients

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega, t) = g_\alpha g_{\alpha'} \int_0^\infty ds e^{i\omega s}\text{tr}(B_\alpha(t)B_{\alpha'}(t-s)\rho_B^{SS}(t)) \quad (6)$$

The Born approximation translates to $|\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}| \ll \Delta_S, \gamma_B$ where Δ_S and γ_B are the system's minimum energy gap and bath relaxation rate, respectively. In the case of annealing dynamics such that the system Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$ varies over time, we need the further assumption of slow annealing to apply the master equation in terms of the instantaneous eigenenergies, $H_S(t) = \sum_\epsilon \epsilon_t\Pi(\epsilon, t)$ [26].

Thermalization Condition- Define $\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(-\omega, t) = \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(-\omega, t) + \Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(-\omega, t)$. The following relation is a *sufficient* condition on the dynamics (5) to have the Gibbs state $\rho_{th} = \frac{e^{-H_S/T}}{\text{Tr}(e^{-H_S/T})}$ as its steady-state,

$$\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(-\omega, t) = e^{-\omega/T}\gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(\omega, t) \quad (7)$$

For time-homogenous fluctuations where $\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}$ is time-independent, the uniqueness of the steady-state of (5) guaranteed if any two energy levels $\{|\epsilon\rangle, |\epsilon'\rangle\}$ are either coupled directly through an operator S_α ($\langle\epsilon|S_\alpha|\epsilon'\rangle \neq 0$) or indirectly via intermediate levels $\{|\epsilon_j\rangle\}$ ($\langle\epsilon|S_j|\epsilon_j\rangle ... \langle\epsilon_{j'}|S_{j'}|\epsilon'\rangle \neq 0$). See the appendix for details of the thermalization condition. Condition (7) is a generalization of the KMS condition, which is automatically satisfied if the bath steady-state is thermal, $\rho_B^{SS} = \frac{e^{-H_B/T}}{\text{Tr}(e^{-H_B/T})}$ [16]. We next discuss how to engineer the KMS condition (7) with a non-thermal bath.

We approximate the KMS condition with a collection of baths (fig. 1) with spectrum functions $\Gamma_{\alpha,\nu}(\omega)$ which satisfy relation (7) collectively (but not individually):

$$\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega) = \sum_\nu \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha',\nu}(\omega) \text{ and } \frac{\sum_\nu \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha',\nu}(-\omega)}{\sum_\nu \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha',\nu}(\omega)} \approx e^{-\omega/T} \quad (8)$$

We assume this condition holds in a relevant range of energies $[\omega_{min}, \omega_{max}]$. The corresponding interaction Hamiltonian is $H_I = \sum_\alpha S_\alpha \otimes \sum_\nu g_{\alpha,\nu}B_\nu$ whose time-homogenous fluctuation functions are given by

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha',\nu}(\omega) = g_{\alpha,\nu}g_{\alpha',\nu} \int_{-\infty}^\infty ds e^{i\omega s}\text{Tr}(\tilde{B}_\nu(s)\tilde{B}_\nu(0)\rho_\nu^{SS}) \quad (9)$$

Here we assume that bath ν is in steady state ρ_ν^{SS}. Before proceeding with a device proposal, we discuss how to satisfy the initial state assumption.



FIG. 1: A cartoon for a thermal bath, a discrete set of baths that collectively satisfy the KMS condition (7).

Initial State Condition- In the early steps of deriving master equation (3), we assumed that

$$tr_B[\tilde{H}_I(t), \rho_{SB}(0)] = tr(\tilde{B}(t)\rho_B(0))[\tilde{S}(t), \rho_S(0)] = 0, \quad (10)$$

which can be guaranteed in the following two ways:

I) Quantum simulation mode: Here the goal is to generate a Gibbs state for a fixed Hamiltonian for which it is enough to

initialize the system in a maximally mixed state, i.e. $\rho_S(0) \propto I_S$. We can prepare such an initial state by applying white noise to the qubits, since a maximally mixed state is the fixed point of random unitary transformations [27, 28].

II) Quantum annealing mode: In this mode, the Hamiltonian is time-dependent and we want to vary the temperature during the evolution. We achieve condition (10) by redefining the system-bath interaction such that $tr(\tilde{B}(t)\rho_B(0)) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{SB} &= H_S + \sum_\alpha S_\alpha \otimes B_\alpha(t) + H_B \\ &= \tilde{H}_S + \sum_\alpha S_\alpha \otimes (B_\alpha(t) - \langle B_\alpha(t)\rangle) + H_B \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with modified system Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_S = H_S + \sum_\alpha S_\alpha \langle B_\alpha(t)\rangle$. We consider mode II in the following device proposal.

A Bath of Resonators- Here we propose realizing a thermal bath by a set of driven lossy microwave resonators. Consider a system of superconducting qubits with Hamiltonian H_S collectively coupled to resonators with mode frequencies $\{\omega_\nu\}$

$$H_{SB} = H_S + \sum g_{\alpha\nu} S_\alpha (a_\nu + a_\nu^\dagger) + \sum_\nu \omega_\nu a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu \quad (12)$$

The system operator S_α is a local operator on qubit α. In general, for each qubit we should have a coupling to the bath via two non-commuting operators $\{S_\alpha^1, S_\alpha^2\}$ so that at least one of them is non-commuting with the system Hamiltonian. We comment here that, in practice, each resonator can be coupled to a finite group of qubits. Therefore, for a large system, the bath would consist of local patches of resonators. Here for the ease of presentation we consider the case of a single collective coupling (12).

We classically drive each resonator mode ω_ν at frequency $\omega_d^\nu \equiv \Delta_\nu + \omega_\nu$ and amplitude $\mathcal{E}_\nu$ while the resonator loses photons at rate κ_ν. The steady-state of such a driven lossy resonator is a coherent state $|\alpha_\nu\rangle = |\frac{\mathcal{E}_\nu}{\Delta_\nu + i\frac{\kappa_\nu}{2}}\rangle$. The number of photons stored in this resonator, $\bar{N}_\nu = a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu$, fluctuates as [12]

$$\langle \bar{N}_\nu(t)\bar{N}_\nu(t-s)\rangle - \langle \bar{N}_\nu(t)\rangle\langle \bar{N}_\nu(t-s)\rangle = e^{(i\Delta_\nu + \kappa_\nu)s}|\alpha_\nu|^2 \quad (13)$$

with Loretzian spectrum

$$\Gamma_\nu^{Lorentz}(\omega) = \frac{|\alpha_\nu|^2 \kappa_\nu}{(\omega + \Delta_\nu)^2 + \kappa_\nu^2} \quad (14)$$

Using the transformation introduced in ref. [23], we rewrite the Hamiltonian in the dispersive regime where the resonators are detuned from system frequencies that are stronger than their coupling. Explicitly, for a system spectral decomposition $H_S = \sum_j \Omega_j |j\rangle\langle j|$, the dispersive regime is defined as

$$|\langle j| \sum_\alpha g_{\alpha\nu} S_\alpha |k\rangle| \ll |\omega_\nu - (\Omega_k - \Omega_j)| \quad (15)$$

Biasing the resonator in this regime requires some knowledge about the largest energy scale in the system (this can be easily estimated for an Ising Hamiltonian H_S). For a graph of coupled spins, the energy differences $\Omega_k - \Omega_j$ can be upper-bounded by the maximum of each node's degree of connectivity times the largest edge strength, which is computable in a time linear in the number of spins.

In this regime, as we discuss in the appendix, the system-resonators Hamiltonian is

$$H_{SB}^D \approx H_S^* + \sum_\nu \omega_\nu a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu + \sum_\nu S_\nu (a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu - \langle a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu\rangle) \quad (16)$$

The system Hamiltonian is perturbatively modified as

$$\begin{aligned} H_S^* &= H_S - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\nu} g_{\alpha,\nu}\Big[((1+|\alpha_\nu|^2)A_\alpha^\dagger - A_\alpha)S_\alpha + h.c.\Big] \\ \text{with} \quad \mathrm{A}_\nu &= \sum_{\mathrm{jk}} \frac{|\langle \mathrm{j}| \sum_\alpha \mathrm{g}_{\alpha\nu}\mathrm{S}_\alpha |\mathrm{k}\rangle|}{\omega_\nu + \Omega_\mathrm{j} - \Omega_\mathrm{k}} |\mathrm{j}\rangle\langle \mathrm{k}| \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and system couples to the resonators via operators

$$S_\nu = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\nu} g_{\alpha,\nu}[S_\alpha, A_\nu^\dagger - A_\nu] \quad (18)$$

In order to complete the design, the resonators should satisfy condition (8) with $\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha',\nu} = \delta_{\alpha,\alpha'}\Gamma_\nu^{Lorentz}$, which requires solving the optimization problem

$$\min_{N_\#, \mathcal{E}_\nu, \kappa_\nu, \omega_\nu^d} \int_{\omega_{min}}^{\omega_{max}} d\omega \Big| \frac{\Gamma_\nu^{Lorentz}(-\omega)}{\Gamma_\nu^{Lorentz}(\omega)} - e^{-\omega/T}\Big| \quad (19)$$

to a desired precision for any temperature T. $N_\#$ is the number of required resonators. Solving (19) determines the design parameters: number of resonators, drive amplitudes and frequencies, and leakage rates. The parameter that requires extra hardware for on-chip tuning is the leakage rate, for which ref.[29] presents one particular design. The optimization problem (19) can be solved to a desired precision following the kernel properties of the Lorentzian function [30, 31]. Basically, we can split the resonators in two groups a and b satisfying

$$\sum_\nu \Gamma_{\nu,a}^{Lorentz}(\omega) \approx e^{\omega/T} G(\omega), \sum_\nu \Gamma_{\nu,b}^{Lorentz} \approx 0 \quad (20)$$

for $\omega \in [-\omega_{max}, -\omega_{min}]$ and

$$\sum_\nu \Gamma_{\nu,a}^{Lorentz} \approx 0, \sum_\nu \Gamma_{\nu,b}^{Lorentz}(\omega) \approx G(\omega) \quad (21)$$

for $\omega \in [\omega_{min}, \omega_{max}]$, and for some even function $G(\omega)$.

Note that relations (20) and (21) are presented for the sake of mathematical completeness. However, in practice one can directly solve (19). In a device implementation, we would be able to couple a qubit to a finite number of resonators and this limits the scalability of this proposal (to be discussed below).

Both modifications to the system Hamiltonian $H_S^* - H_S$ and system-bath couplings have strength $\max|\frac{g_{\alpha\nu}g_{\beta\nu}}{\omega_\nu+\Omega_j-\Omega_k}|$. This implies a trade-off between simulation accuracy $\big($i.e. $\frac{e^{-H_S^*/T}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H_S^*/T})}$ instead of $\frac{e^{-H_S/T}}{\mathrm{Tr}(e^{-H_S/T})}$ $\big)$ and thermalization speed. Such a trade-off would be a limitation in quantum simulation mode, though in the annealing mode we could turn off the thermal bath toward the end of annealing and the system would return to the original Hamiltonian H_S. In other words, the annealing paths and not the problem Hamiltonian are perturbatively modified due to the dispersive approximation [2, 32]. An important related question is the effect of the dispersive modification on the minimum system gap [2, 32]. We leave the question open as it is beyond the scope of the present work.

Qubit Chain Example- Here we discuss a basic experimental realization of the thermal bath proposal for a chain of superconducting qubits coupled to a single mode resonator. Fig.(2) is a sketch for the experiment with transmon qubits described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{SB} = H_S + \sum g_\alpha X_\alpha (a + a^\dagger) + \omega_c a^\dagger a \qquad (22)$$

$$H_S = \sum_\alpha \omega_\alpha Z_\alpha + J_\alpha Z_\alpha Z_{\alpha+1}, \qquad (23)$$

where Z_α and X_α are Pauli operators and real numbers J_α are nearest-neighbor coupling strengths. For this system, the thermal bath should operate within energy interval

$$[\omega_{min}, \omega_{max}] = 2[\min_\alpha(\omega_\alpha - J_\alpha - J_{\alpha-1}), \max_\alpha(\omega_\alpha + J_\alpha + J_{\alpha-1})] \qquad (24)$$

In the numerics we consider parameters $\omega_\alpha = 2.5$ GHz, $g_\alpha = 300$ MHz, and an ensemble of random Hamiltonians with coupling $J_\alpha \in [-100, 100]$ MHz. We examine the limits of the proposal by choosing values for the resonator parameters in the range supported by the theory. Namely, we need to have $\kappa_c \ll \omega_c$ for Markovian photon leakage, and $\omega_c \ll 2\min(\omega_\alpha - J_\alpha - J_{\alpha-1})$ for the dispersive approximation, that is $\omega_c = 3.1GHz$ and $\kappa_c = 620MHz$. From master equation (5), we find the rate of cooling and heating between levels with energy difference Ω are $\Gamma(\Omega)$ and $\Gamma(-\Omega)$ where

$$\Gamma(\omega) = \frac{\bar{N}\kappa_c}{(\omega+\Delta)^2 + (\frac{\kappa_c}{2})^2}(\frac{2\omega g^2}{\omega_c^2 - \omega^2})^2 \qquad (25)$$

Here $\bar{N}$ is the average photon number stored in the resonator, which is proportional to the incident power. The only parameter that we optimize in condition (19) is the drive detuning Δ such that the Gibbs state is prepared with above $\%95$ fidelity. All drives are red detuned, i.e. $\Delta < 0$. Fig.(3) shows the average rate of cooling and heating for range $\Omega \in [\omega_{min}, \omega_{max}]$. The solid blue and red lines are rates of heating and cooling per single photon $\bar{N} = 1$ for different target temperatures. As we drive the resonator more strongly, the rates increase, in principle, to the theoretical limit, shown by dotted blue and red lines. However, in practice the resonator enters its regime of nonlinearity for strong drives, restricting the maximum achievable heating and cooling rates. We also plot in green the summation of heating and cooling rate that corresponds to the all-spin sweep rate in simulated thermal annealing [33]. Since the Hamiltonian is Ising and bath operations are spin flips, within current technology the relevant imperfection is the presence of dissipation with a T_1 time scale of about 6.2 kHz [34].



FIG. 2: A schematic for transmon qubits coupled to a resonator acting as a thermal bath.



FIG. 3: Average rate of cooling, heating and sweeping for frequency range $[4.6, 5.4]GHz$. Solid blue (red) is heating (cooling) rate for single photon drive. Dashed blue (red) is an upper bound for heating (cooling) rate. The green line corresponds to the annealing sweep rate also at the single photon level.

Discussion and outlook- We introduced the concept of a universal thermal bath to set the effective temperature of a quantum system. We presented a proposal for a superconducting realization of this bath based on multiple single mode resonators coupled to the system qubits. An alternative option for a scalable design would be a meta-material with a continuous range of resonator modes [35, 36]. The current theory for meta-materials (both design and dynamical response) is very limited and requires fundamental developments before we can apply it to design a thermal bath.

Thermal jumps can boost the success rate of quantum annealing computations. Basically, a hybrid quantum-classical annealer is computationally more powerful than a zero-temperature quantum annealer [37, 38]. In an analog implementation of such a hybrid annealer, the rate of thermalization is a key parameter setting the speed of computation. A major challenge to overcome in the current proposal is enhancing the rate of thermalization to a level that benefits an analog computation of quantum annealers with tens of qubits. Note that the existing annealing processor, the DWave machine, lacks such a temperature tunablility [39].

Another important feature of our proposal which requires further analysis is its stability with respect to device imperfections and theory approximations. Some techniques recently developed to study the stability of dissipative quantum dynamics [40, 41] could be useful for this purpose. Also note that we only discussed rates of transitions between energy levels to compare with update rates in simulated thermal algorithm.

Acknowledgments- We thank Kristan Temme for helpful discussions on quantum Metropolis algorithms.

[1] R. K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics*, Butterworth-Heinemann, 3rd Edition, 2011.
[2] A. Das, B. K. Chakrabar, *Quantum Annealing and Related Optimization Methods*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer, 2005.
[3] K. Nishimori, *Statistical Physics of Spin Glasses and Information Processing, Clarendon Press, 2001*
[4] C. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*, Springer, 2007.
[5] M. E. J. Newman, G. T. Barkema, *Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics*, Clarendon Press, 1999.
[6] M. Troyer, Uwe-Jens Wiese, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 170201 (2005).
[7] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A 61, 022301 (2002).
[8] D. Poulin, P. Wocjan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 220502 (2009).
[9] K. Temme, T. J. Osborne, K. G. Vollbrecht, D. Poulin, and F. Verstraete, Quantum Metropolis sampling., Nature 471, 87 (2011).
[10] M. H. Yung, A. Aspuru-Guzik, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 109, 754-759 (2012).
[11] A. Riera, C. Gogolin, J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 080402 (2012).
[12] A. A. Clerk, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, F. Marquardt, R. J. Schoelkopf, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 1155 (2010).
[13] E. Kapit, Phys. Rev. A 92, 012302 (2015).
[14] S. Hacohen-Gourgy, V. Ramasesh, C. De Grandi, I. Siddiqi, and S. M. Girvin, arXiv:1506.05837.
[15] O. Fialko, arXiv:1505.07878.
[16] H. P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, The Theory of Open Quantum Systems, Oxford University Press (2007).
[17] A. Blais, R. S. Huang, A. Wallraff, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Phys. Rev. A 69, 062320 (2004).
[18] R. P. Erickson, M. R. Vissers, M. Sandberg, S. R. Jefferts, and D. P. Pappas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 187002 (2014).
[19] C. Grezes *et al*, Phys. Rev. X 4, 021049 (2014).
[20] N. M. Sundaresan, Phys. Rev. X 5, 021035 (2015).
[21] D. J. Egger and F. K. Wilhelm, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 163601 (2013).
[22] A. Frigerio, Communications in Mathematical Physics 63, 269 (1978).
[23] A. Shabani, J. Roden, and B. K. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 113601 (2014).
[24] M. Haeberlein *et al*, arXiv:1506.09114.
[25] B.L.T. Plourde, H. Wang, F. Rouxinol, M. D. LaHaye, arXiv:1505.01015.
[26] T. Albash, S. Boixo, D. A. Lidar, P. Zanardi, New J. Phys. 14, 123016 (2012).
[27] D. Burgarth, G. Chiribella, V. Giovannetti, P. Perinotti, K. Yuasa, New J. Phys. 15, 073045. (2013).
[28] J. Novotny, G. Alber, and I. Jex, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42 282003 (2009).
[29] M. Pierre, I. Svensson, S.R. Sathyamoorthy, G. Johansson, and P. Delsing, Appl. Phys. Lett. 104, 232604 (2014).
[30] N. Barnea, V.D. Efros, W. Leidemann, G. Orlandini, Few Body Syst. 47, 201 (2010).
[31] G Orlandini, W Leidemann, V D Efros, N Barnea, J.Phys.G 37,064011 (2010).
[32] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, M. Sipser, arXiv:quant-ph/0001106.
[33] S. Boixo *et al*, Nature Phys. 10, 218 (2014).
[34] O. Dial *et al*, arXiv:1509.03859.
[35] D. J. Egger, F. K. Wilhelm, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 163601 (2013).
[36] M. Haeberlein *et al*, arXiv:1506.09114.
[37] J. Brooke, D. Bitko, T. F. Rosenbaum, and G. Aeppli, Science 284, 779 (1999).
[38] S. Tanaka, R. Tamura, I. Sato, and K. Kurihara, arXiv:1104.3246.
[39] www.dwavesys.com
[40] T. S. Cubitt, A. Lucia, S. Michalakis, and D. Perez-Garcia, Comm. Math. Phys. 337, 1275 (2015).
[41] A. Lucia, T. S. Cubitt, S. Michalakis, and D. Prez-Garca, Phys. Rev. A 91, 040302 (2015).

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Thermalization Condition

In order to prove that Eq. (7) suffices for the Gibbs state to be a fixed point, we need to show $\mathcal{D}(\rho_{th}) = 0$ holds assuming (7). Using the following identities: $\rho_{th} S_\alpha(\omega) = e^{\omega/T} S_\alpha(\omega)\rho_{th}$ and $S_\alpha^\dagger(\omega) = S_\alpha(-\omega)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\rho_{th}) &= \sum_{\omega,\alpha,\alpha'} \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)\Big(S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\rho_{th}S_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\omega) - S_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\rho_{th}\Big) + \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)\Big(S_{\alpha}(\omega)\rho_{th}S_{\alpha'}^{\dagger}(\omega) - S_{\alpha'}^{\dagger}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\rho_{th}\Big) \\
&= \sum_{\omega,\alpha,\alpha'} \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} + \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&= \sum_{\omega,\alpha,\alpha'} \frac{\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)+\Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}^{*}(\omega,t)}{2}\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&+\frac{\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)+\Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(\omega,t)}{2}\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&+\frac{\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)-\Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}^{*}(\omega,t)}{2}\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&+\frac{\Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)-\Gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(\omega,t)}{2}\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the last two terms sum to zero.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\rho_{th}) = \sum_{\omega>0,\alpha,\alpha'} &\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} + \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&+\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(-\omega,t)\Big(e^{\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega) - S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} + \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(-\omega,t)\Big(e^{\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega)\Big)\rho_{th}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we use thermal condition $\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(-\omega,t) = e^{-\omega/T}\gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(\omega,t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\rho_{th}) = \sum_{\omega>0,\alpha,\alpha'} &\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} + \gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^{*}(\omega,t)\Big(e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega) - S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} \\
&+\gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}(\omega,t)\Big(S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)S_{\alpha}(\omega) - e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(-\omega)\Big)\rho_{th} + \gamma_{\alpha'\alpha}^{*}(\omega,t)\Big(S_{\alpha}(-\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega) - e^{-\omega/T}S_{\alpha'}(\omega)S_{\alpha}(-\omega)\Big)\rho_{th}
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that this last summation is also zero!

Now we consider the uniqueness of the fixed point which is guaranteed by ergodicity of the dynamics. The Davies-Frigiero-Spohn criterion [22] states that given Lindblad dynamics with diagonal form $\dot{\rho} = -i[H,\rho] + \sum_j 2L_j\rho L_j^{\dagger} - L_j^{\dagger}L_j\rho - \rho L_j^{\dagger}L_j$, the necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of a steady-state is $\{L_j, L_j^{\dagger}, H_S\}' = c\mathbb{1}$, where $\{.\}'$ indicates the commutant and c is a constant. The Lindblad equation (5) is not in diagonal form, and in the lab frame $\dot{\rho} = -i[H_S,\rho] + \sum_{\omega,\alpha,\alpha'}\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}(\omega,t)\Big(2S_{\alpha'}(\omega)\rho S_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\omega) - \{S_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\omega)S_{\alpha'}(\omega),\rho\}\Big)$. Here we only consider time-homogenous dynamics. The coefficients $\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}$ change continuously as we change the effective temperature, meanwhile the Davies-Frigiero-Spohn criterion for the diagonalized form of our Lindblad equation should hold for any values of $\gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}$. In this situation, following some simple linear algebra, the necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness of Gibbs state as a fixed point is

$$\{S_{\alpha}(\omega), S_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\omega), H_S\}' = c\mathbb{1} \tag{26}$$

We can justify this condition as follows: for an element T of the commutant set we have $[T,H_S]=0$, ($H_S = \sum_j \Omega_j|j\rangle\langle j|$), therefore $T = \sum_j t_j|j\rangle\langle j|$ for some numbers t_j. T should also commute with $S_{\alpha}(\omega)$, so that

$$[T,S_{\alpha}(\omega)] = [\sum_j t_j|j\rangle\langle j|, \sum_{\epsilon'-\epsilon=\omega}\Pi(\epsilon)S_{\alpha}\Pi(\epsilon')] = \sum_{\epsilon'-\epsilon=\omega}(t_{\epsilon}-t_{\epsilon'})\Pi(\epsilon)S_{\alpha}\Pi(\epsilon') = 0 \tag{27}$$

This dictates a block-diagonal form each proportional to identity, $T = \oplus_q c_q I_q$. The unique fixed point condition is satisfied if T reduces to a single block or $c_q = c\ \forall q$. Such a condition holds for any two energy levels $\{|\epsilon\rangle, |\epsilon'\rangle\}$ iff either there exist operators $\{S_{\alpha_j}\}$ and intermediate levels $\{|\epsilon_j\rangle\}$ such that either $\langle\epsilon|S_{\alpha}|\epsilon'\rangle \neq 0$ or $\langle\epsilon|S_{\alpha_j}|\epsilon_j\rangle...\langle\epsilon_{j'}|S_{\alpha_{j'}}|\epsilon'\rangle \neq 0$. This has a simple physical interpretation, which is that population can be transferred between all levels via coupling to the bath.

B. Dispersive Regime

Here we show the details of the dispersive transformation. Start with the Hamiltonian in Eq.(12)

$$H_{SB} = H_S + \sum g_{\alpha\nu} S_\alpha (a_\nu + a_\nu^\dagger) + \sum_\nu \omega_\nu a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu \tag{28}$$

Apply the dispersive transformation $U_D = \exp[\sum A_\nu a_\nu^\dagger - A_\nu^\dagger a_\nu]$, where $A_\nu = \sum_{jk} \frac{|\langle j| \sum_\alpha g_{\alpha\nu} S_\alpha |k\rangle|}{\omega_\nu + \Omega_j - \Omega_k} |j\rangle\langle k|$. Assuming different modes are driven in off-detuned frequencies we drop the cross-mode coupling terms $a_\nu^\dagger a_{\nu'}$ induced by the dispersive transformation and arrive at

$$H_{SB}^D = U_D H_{SB} U_D^\dagger \approx H_S^D + \sum_\nu \omega_\nu a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu + \sum_\nu S_\nu a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu \tag{29}$$

where the modified system Hamiltonian is $H_S^D = H_S - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\nu} g_{\alpha,\nu}(A_\nu^\dagger S_\alpha + S_\alpha A_\nu)$, and the new system operators for resonator couplings are $S_\nu = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\nu} g_{\alpha,\nu}[S_\alpha, A_\nu^\dagger - A_\nu]$. Cavity leakage causes additional system decoherence (Purcell-like effect). Following Eq.(4) in ref.[23], it is caused by a virtual coupling between system and outside reservoir. The corresponding decoherence rate is $\kappa_\nu \frac{g_{\alpha,\nu}^2}{(\omega_\nu - (\Omega_j - \Omega_k))^2}$, which we can ignore in comparison with the heating rate (Eq.(25)) when $\bar{N} > \frac{1}{4}(1 + \frac{\Delta}{\Omega})$. The drive Hamiltonians are also modified under the dispersive transformation: the system drive term at frequency ω_ν^d is far off-resonance so that it does not excite the system, and this still holds when corrections of order $\frac{g_{\alpha,\nu}}{\omega_\nu - (\Omega_j - \Omega_k)}$ are added.